

Remarks

In the Office communication, there is a box in line 10 which has been checked. However, there is no indication in the Office communication of any correction required to the drawing. The Applicants therefore assume that the box in line 10 which has been checked is an error.

In accordance with the Examiner's final requirement for election, Claim 9 has been indicated as withdrawn.

In accordance with the Examiner's requirement, the Applicants are preparing an IDS which lists EP 1,355,485, which is the published version of EP Application 02090147.6, which is discussed on page 4 of the instant specification, and which was previously identified in an IDS. The IDS will include an English-language translation of DE 10,227,062, which was previously identified in an IDS. The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to consider these documents.

Claim 1 has been amended to remove the terms "relates" and "registered" to which the Examiner has objected.

Claimed 2 has been amended to indicate that HAVi is an international standard, so as to overcome the Examiner's objection.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 4 as having insufficient basis for "logging on" and "logging off". These terms have been added to parent Claim 1.

The Examiner has objected to the terminology in Claims 5 and 6. These Claims have been clarified to indicate that the terminology is defined in HAVi.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 to 4 as anticipated by US 2005/0078679 to Henry et al. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the invention. Nowhere do Henry et al. show or suggest:

"the network station from the network or the first type which has a changed input parameter is logged off by the gateway in the network of the second type, in that the changed input parameter is mapped onto an information element which is known in the network of the second type, and the network station from the network of the first type which has a changed input parameter is then once again logged on in the network of the second type",

as specifically set forth in Claim 1. Nowhere do Henry et al log off and then log on to allow stations in network of a second type to be informed about a changed input parameter. It is therefore clear that the patentability of the invention as defined by Claim 1 as amended is not affected by Henry et al.

Claims 2 to 4 are dependent from Claim 1 and add further advantageous features.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 5 to 8 as unpatentable over Henry et al in view of US 6,456,892 to Dara-Abrams et al. Dara-Abrams et al. mentions changing the name of a device inside a HAVi network. However, Dara-Abrams et al. relates to a homogeneous network type, namely a HAVi network. Nowhere does Dara-Abrams et al. mention any different network type, much less any problem involved with connecting to a network of a different type over a bridge or gateway device. It is therefore clear that even if Dara-Abrams et al. were to be combined with Henry et al, the invention defined by Claim 1 would not be obtained, and the advantageous features provided by dependent Claims 5 to 8 would also not be obtained.

The Applicants have reviewed the art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon. The Applicants believe that such art is no more relevant to the claimed invention than the art upon which the Examiner has relied.

The applicants therefore submit that the instant application is a condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

No fee in addition to the fee for an extension of time is believed to have been incurred by virtue of this amendment. However if an additional fee is incurred on the basis of this amendment, please charge such fee against deposit account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Ingo Hutter
Michael Weber

Date: 10 June 2009

/Daniel E. Sragow/
By: Daniel E. Sragow
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 22,856
609/734-6832

THOMSON Licensing Inc.
Patent Operation
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312